

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 were pending when last examined. Claims 1-4, 7 and 8 are currently amended and new claims 9-10 are added. Support for the amended and new claims can be found in the specification and original claims as filed. No new matter has been added.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH

At page 2, item 2, the Official Action rejects claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Official Action questions whether the "diamond form" of carbon can perform in the electron-emitting manner recited in claim 3. Currently amended claim 3 is directed to the electron-emitting woven fabric according to claim 2, wherein the carbonaceous material is one or more selected from a group consisting of carbon nanotubes and fullerenes, and no longer features "diamond-like carbon." The specification enables the full scope of claim 3. Thus, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

At page 3, item 3, the Official Action rejects claims 2-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Currently amended claims 1, 3 and 4 address each of the issues noted in the rejection. In particular, currently amended claim 1 provides proper antecedent support for the "electron-emitting woven fabric" as featured in claims 2-8. Currently amended claim 3 features carbon nanotubes and fullerenes (plural form). Also, amended claim 3 no longer recites "diamond-like carbon". Claim 5 depends from claim 4, which has been amended to depend from claim 3. Thus, antecedent support for "the fullerenes" in claim 5 can be found in claim 3.

Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

At page 4, item 6, the Office Action objects to claim 7 because of informalities. Currently amended claim 7 addresses the informalities noted in the Official Action and further clarifies the diameter of the second linear body. Thus, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 102

At page 4, item 7, the Official Action rejects claims 1 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by BARRERA et al. (WO 01/92381 A1). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Currently amended claim 1 is directed to an electron-emitting woven fabric comprising first linear bodies having a conductive layer covered with an insulating layer, and second linear bodies formed of a conductive material and crossing the

first linear bodies, wherein electrons are emitted from cross parts of the first linear bodies and the second linear bodies. BARRERA fails to teach or suggest this fabric.

BARRERA describes a method of embedding nanofibers in a polymer matrix that provides for easier and more controlled handling (see, paragraphs [0011]-[0012] of US2006/0047052). BARRERA, however fails to teach or suggest first linear bodies and second linear bodies crossed to form cross parts, wherein electrons are emitted from the cross parts, as featured in claim 1. For at least this reason, BARRERA fails to teach or suggest, and fails to anticipate, the electron-emitting woven fabric of claim 1, and claim 6 dependent thereon. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 103

At page 6, items 8 and 9, the Official Action rejects claims 2, 3 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over BARRERA, and rejects claim 8 as being unpatentable over BARRERA in view of SMALLEY (US 2003/0133865 A1) and KOCHANSKI et al. (US 5,838,118). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

As detailed in the remarks above, BARRERA fails to teach or suggest an electron-emitting woven fabric having the combination of features recited in claim 1. The secondary references, SMALLEY and KOCHANSKI, fail to remedy the deficient teachings of BARRERA.

Each of claims 2, 3, 7 and 8 depends from claim 1. Thus, BARRERA, SMALLEY and/or KOCHANSKI, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest, and fail to render obvious, claims 2, 3, 7 and 8. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or proposals for expediting prosecution, please contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/H. James Voeller/

H. James Voeller, Reg. No. 48,015
Customer No. 00466
209 Madison Street, Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

HJV/dp